

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-39 are pending in this case.

Claims 1-4, 15-22, and 33-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Matthews, III et al. U.S. Publication No. 2004/0139465 ("Matthews") in view of Shoff et al. U.S. Publication No. 2005/0015815 ("Shoff"). Claims 1-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Herz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,758,257 ("Herz") in view of Matthews and Shoff.

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 19 in order to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed application. (See, e.g., applicants' specification at ¶¶ 106 and 108.)

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Applicants' Reply

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 15-22, and 33-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Matthews in view of Shoff. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants' invention, as defined by amended independent claims 1 and 19, is directed to a system and method for managing and displaying information in an interactive television system. A first user selection of a television program title and a second user selection requesting data available on a public network related to the selected title are received. The public network is searched to identify data that is related to a program corresponding to the selected television

program title and that includes at least one item available for purchase. The identified data is then downloaded and displayed.

Matthews is directed to an electronic programming guide (EPG) which visually correlates program titles to scheduled viewing times. A hyperlink browser resides in the memory, and one or more hyperlinks are integrated as part of the EPG user interface. The hyperlinks reference target resources containing interactive content related to the video programs, and are supplied with the program records received from the headend. (Matthews, Abstract, FIG. 2, and ¶ 69.)

Shoff is directed to an electronic programming guide (EPG) which determines if the present program being viewed is interactive. If the program is interactive, a target specification stored in the EPG is used to activate a target resource containing supplemental content for enhancing the program (Shoff, Abstract).

Applicants respectfully submit that Matthews and Shoff, whether taken alone or in combination, do not show or suggest searching a public network for data related to a program corresponding to the television program title selected by the user, as defined by applicants' claims 1 and 19. Instead, in Matthews, hyperlinks are stored in memory and can be displayed with channel or program listings or with program descriptions. In particular, because in Matthews the hyperlinks are supplied with program records from the headend, Matthews does not show or suggest searching for data on a public network that are related to a user selected program title. Additionally, in Shoff, predetermined target specifications enable retrieval of supplemental content, but nowhere does Shoff show or suggest a search for data related to a selected title being performed. Thus, Shoff does not make up for the deficiencies of Matthews in that regard. Therefore, Matthews and Shoff, alone or in

combination, do not show or suggest all the features of applicants' claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Herz in view of Matthews and Shoff. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Herz discusses a system for developing user profiles. The Herz system can recommend music or book selections based on the profile. The recommendations are generated by comparing the user profiles with characteristics of video programs. The characteristics (content profiles) of the video programs are created and stored in a local database. (Herz, Abstract; FIGS. 1-3; column 4, lines 59-64; column 24, lines 53-60; and column 50, lines 44-54.)

Applicants respectfully submit that Herz does not show or suggest searching a public network to identify data that is related to a program corresponding to a selected television program title, as defined by applicants' claims 1 and 19. Instead, in Herz, an aggregation of customer profiles is used to determine a list of "preferred channel selections" that may be available on a "virtual channel" (Herz, column 45, lines 34-49). Generating a list of preferred channels or recommendations based on user profiles, however, is not the same as receiving a user selection of a displayed program title and searching for data related to a program corresponding to the selected title, as required by applicants' claims. Furthermore, Herz discusses providing recommendations by cross-referencing data in user profiles with program data stored in a local database but nowhere does Herz show or suggest searching a public network for data related to a program corresponding to a selected program title. Thus, Herz does not show or suggest all the elements of applicants' claims. Additionally, for the reasons above,

Matthews and Shoff do not make up for the deficiencies of Herz in that regard.

Therefore, applicants' claims 1 and 19 are patentable over Herz, Matthews, and Shoff. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 19 and claims 2-18 and 20-39, which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 or 19, are patentable.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gall C. Gotfried/

Gall C. Gotfried
Registration No. 58,333
Agent for Applicants
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 75563